UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/2001/10
30 October 2000

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Fifty-seventh session
Items 10 and 11 (c) of the provisional agenda

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE QUESTIONS OF:
FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Letter dated 8 August 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights

I attach the United Kingdom's responses* to the reports of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights to education and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of opinion and expression on their visits to the United Kingdom in 1999 (E/CN.4/2000/6/Add.2 and E/CN.4/2000/63/Add.3 respectively). Please could you arrange to have them circulated as official documents of the Commission on Human Rights.

(Signed) Guy WARRINGTON
Chargé d'affaires

* Reproduced as received, in English only.

GE.00-15692 (E)

Annex

United Kingdom Mission

To the Office of the
United Nations and Other
International Organisations at Geneva
37/39 Rue de Vermont
1211 Geneva 20

Telephone: 918 2300
Facsimile: 918 2333

From the Permanent Representative

10 April 2000

Professor Katarina Tomasevski
UN Special Rapporteur on the
Right to Education
c/o Office of the High Commissioner
for Human Rights
Palais Wilson
51 rue des Pâquis
1201 Geneva

Dear Professor Tomasevski,

I have been asked by London to forward to you some additional information relevant to your Report on your visit to the United Kingdom last October.

We would particularly like to draw your attention to the opportunities for education in prisons, and the provision of education for certain groups of children, including Travellers.

We would be happy to clarify any points on which you require further information.

Yours sincerely,

S W J Fuller

SUBJECT: SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON THE RIGHTS TO EDUCATION: VISIT TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, OCTOBER 1999.

CHR 56: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY MR S W J FULLER, ESQ, CMG, UNITED KINGDOM PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UN IN GENEVA

Paragraph 15

We are concerned that this paragraph gives a misleading impression that performance data are only about producing competitive league tables.

The data collected within the UK provides a more sophisticated analysis and is valuable to individual teachers and schools for assessing the performance and needs of specific groups of pupils including low achievers.

Paragraph 18

The Prime Minister's aim of achieving a 25% share of the HE student market relates specifically to English speaking countries. This point is made clear in the enclosed Government news release for 18 June, which puts some flesh on the bones of the Prime Minister's announcement.

Paragraph 28

We would like to point out that the recent increase in public expenditure for education within the UK will not leave it at the bottom of the OECD ranking. Latest available OECD data - published in *Education at a Glance 1998* - shows that UK expenditure as a percentage of GDP was higher than for 12 other OECD countries, including for example Germany and Japan. (Please see the detailed chart of data which immediately follows page 30 of *Education at a Glance 1998*.)

Paragraph 37

We would like to point out that the term 'ethnic minority' is in common use in the UK and is accepted by all minorities. While it is true that the civil service has a disproportionately low number of non-white members in more senior grades, this is currently being addressed by the Government and has no bearing on the prevalent use of the term 'ethnic minority'.

Paragraph 41

We are concerned that your suggestion that "the underlying rationale discourages the investment of time and effort necessary for those learners who are unlikely to do well" does

not square with the evidence. The statistics show that standards over the last three years, (as measured by the key stage 2 tests for 11 year olds), have increased most for those schools with most pupils in the lowest socio-economic group. For example: results in the national key stage 2 tests for 11 year olds in Maths and English show a 21 and 19 percentage point increase respectively between 1996 and 1999 for schools in the lowest socio-economic bracket (over 50% of pupils eligible for free school meals), while schools in the highest socio-economic group (less than 8% eligible for free school meals) achieved a 12 point increase in both subjects over the same three year period.

Paragraph 47

We would like to point out that certain groups of children - including Travellers, asylum seekers and refugees have exactly the same rights to choice of school as other children. If Travellers for example find that their school of choice is full, they will be offered an alternative by the Local Education Authority and may also be offered help by the Authority's Traveller Education Service in settling in. Head teachers are not allowed to discriminate against any child, including Travellers and refugees, when allocating school places. Encouraging learning is a fundamental purpose of all schools and there is a variety of legislation in place to secure that appropriate school standards are maintained.

Paragraph 51

Legally there is no duty on the child to attend school. Under Section 7 of the Education Act 1996, the duty rests on parents to secure an adequate education for their children. [This section states that: "The parents of every child of compulsory school age shall cause him to receive efficient full-time education suitable (a) to his age, ability and aptitude, and (b) to any special educational needs he may have, either by regular attendance at school or otherwise."] Where, as the vast majority do, they meet this duty by registering their child at a school, the parent is then under a duty to ensure regular attendance by the child. If the child is not in regular attendance, it is the parent who risks prosecution by the local authority.

Paragraph 59

Your report quotes from the 1997/98 report by the Chief Inspector of Prisons that efficiency savings reduced opportunities for education. This does not take account of the additional £26,000,000 to be spent on educational programmes in prisons leading to national qualifications over the next three years.

The statement that only 30 out of 200 inmates had access to

education in one institution does not take into account other factors eg. at Dover Young Offender institution, where the population is approximately 200, only 30 inmates do have access to full time education provision but the remaining 170 inmates are fully involved in vocational training courses during the daytime; there are also opportunities to participate in education classes during the evening and provision is made for education support within the training setting. Under the Government's comprehensive spending review, this particular institution will be receiving additional funding to develop in-depth assessment and employment related skills provision. Moreover, under a new prison service order all inmates under the age of 17 years will be required to attend 15 hours education provision per week. At present those under 16 years have an entitlement to 15 hours of education per week.

According to reports made by assessors, the environments of prison education departments are often conducive to learning in terms of accommodation, displays of students' and appropriate teaching resources. All prisons in England and Wales provide activities in the areas of literacy, numeracy, English for speakers of other languages, social and life skills and information technology. Appropriate resources are in place to deliver such activities including industry compatible hardware and software for information technology. Innovative developments are happening in prisons. In particular such projects as Peer Partnerships whereby inmates train to support other inmates in basic skills and achieve relevant accreditation; Family Literacy projects where extended visiting hours occur so that parents and children can spend time together in literacy or numeracy focused activities thereby developing positive parenting skills; projects focused on inmates from ethnic minorities, to increase their awareness of multi-cultural literature.

Paragraph 61

We would like to point out that Government guidance on the handling on the handling of illegal encampments reminds local authorities of their duties to ensure that children continue to receive education and there is a special concession in school attendance law (dating back to the early part of this century) on the total number of days per year that Travellers need to attend school. These and other provisions recognise the particular cultural situation of Traveller families.

Paragraph 63

We would like to point out that the specific section of the Green Paper *Excellence for all children* to which you refer is specifically aimed at furthering the Government's agenda for including in mainstream schools all SEN pupils whose parents want this. That is the central reason for reviewing SEN

policies across the board.

Paragraph 64

An entitlement to education designed to meet any special educational needs exists for the entire pupil population; currently some 20% of all pupils have been assessed as having special needs as defined by the Statutory Code of Practice.

Further, we disagree that "large numbers" are excluded. In 1998 less than 1% of children with statements were excluded from school.

Paragraph 65

Tuition fees for university education have been in place for many years, particularly for part-time and postgraduate students. In 1998, tuition fees were introduced only for those full-time undergraduates who can afford them. The reason for doing so is that graduates earn significantly more than non-graduates having university entrance qualifications, and the government believes it right to alter the balance of contributions to the cost of higher education away from the general taxpayer and towards those who will benefit from it and can afford to make a contribution to the cost.

Paragraph 67

We would like to point out that there is no diminution of Government funding for higher education. The revenue raised from tuition fees has been added to the Government's contribution to allow yet further expansion of higher education. The commitment not to make students contribute to their fees was made by a Government of a different political persuasion before the 1997 General Election which brought the present Government to power.

Further, we would like to point out that teaching funding continues to outweigh research funding by about 3:1.

Paragraph 68

The passage in the 1996 OFSTED report on the achievements of ethnic minority groups which you cite (footnote 52) is out of date - more than 50% of students are now women.

Data from UCAS show that the proportion of accepted, young (aged under 21) home domiciled applicants to full-time and sandwich courses at UK universities from socio-economic groups III (manual), IV and V was 25.8% (1996); 26.3% (1997); 26.4% (1998) and 26.7% (1999- figures to November) indicating no reduction but rather a modest increase in the proportion of students from the lower socio-economic groups over the period when tuition fees were introduced for full-time undergraduates

students.

Paragraph 70

The following text supplied by OFSTED gives a more accurate description of the role of OFSTED: "Maintained schools in England are inspected regularly by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) to ensure that they are providing an acceptable standard of education for their pupils. Schools that inspectors judge are failing, or likely to fail, to provide an acceptable standard of education are deemed as requiring special measures. Such schools have to prepare and implement an action plan to improve the education they offer. The implementation of these plans is monitored by Her Majesty's Inspectors who will judge when a school no longer requires special measures. Failure to improve over an extended period of time can result in closure.

Paragraph 79

New guidance for sex and relationship education to ensure children learn about the importance of stable loving relationships, marriage, family life and the bringing up of children was issued by the Education and Employment Secretary David Blunkett on 16 March 2000.

Paragraph 83

The OFSTED review of research does not deny the superior achievement in examinations of girls in single sex schools, as quoted in the 1995 report to CEDAW. It does however indicate that the reasons for this may be largely due to the ability of the intake rather than for any other reason.

Paragraph 85

We would like to point out that the framework for citizenship education published as part of the National Curriculum review includes explicit requirements for pupils to be taught about the legal and human rights underpinning society and their roles and responsibilities as citizens.

Paragraph 91

The Travelling community prefer not to have separate schools for fear of social isolation.

Paragraph 96

The Government is working urgently to tackle the present level of educational performance by boys. However there is no simple, single solution to this problem. A range of inter-related factors explains gender difference in performance, and a range of strategies is needed to address them. The DfEE is

working to ensure that all policies take account of gender issues in their development and implementation. The literacy strategy in primary schools has already started to make an impact. Over the last year the number of 11 year old boys achieving level 4 or above has increased by 14 percentage points to 78% (girls increased by 5 points to 84%). New longitudinal research is to be commissioned on boys' educational achievement this year. [The Department is working with a group of successful primary and secondary head teachers to identify good practice which it intends to disseminate on the Internet in the Summer.]

NEWS RELEASE

278/99

18 June 1999

TONY BLAIR LAUNCHES DRIVE TO ATTRACT OVERSEAS STUDENTS TO UK

The Prime Minister Tony Blair today announced the start of a worldwide campaign to increase the number of overseas students in the UK.

He set a new target of attracting 75,000 extra students to the UK by 2005.

Launching the campaign at The London School of Economics in London today, the Prime Minister said:

"Our universities and colleges are second to none. Their world-class reputation means that they are among the most popular for international students. I am determined to build on this great strength with a long term strategy to attract many more. The institutions, their students and our economy will reap considerable rewards.

"When the G8 leaders meet this weekend, we expect to agree a charter on our ambitions for lifelong learning. We all want to equip our countries for the knowledge-driven society of the next century, and to share our educational strengths with the rest of the world. One of the most important contributions we can make is to ensure that our universities and colleges are open to able students from around the world."

The targets are a significant increase in the UK's share of the fee-paying market from outside the European Union. UK higher education institutions, already second only to US universities, aim to increase their market share, in relation to English-speaking countries, to 25% by 2005 - an extra 50,000 students. Further education colleges are aiming to double the number of international students by 2005 - an extra 25,000 students.

Education and Employment Secretary David Blunkett, said :

" This campaign will be good for UK as well as overseas students. UK universities and colleges will develop an even more international outlook. The students will be more employable as a result. They will have greater opportunities to work alongside top students and researchers from overseas. And our universities and colleges will earn improved revenue for expansion."

In a UK-wide Departmental effort, a package of changes has been agreed to remove unnecessary delay to international students applying for study in the UK. It includes:

- streamlining visa arrangements for students in countries where there are problems;
- reducing the need for international students to reapply for leave to remain in the UK whilst studying;
- putting better information in the hands of potential students, on-screen and through personal advice;
- making it easier for students to combine study with work on campus and in vacations

Welcoming the announcement, Foreign Secretary Robin Cook said:

"Many political, business and intellectual leaders of the world have long term ties with the UK because of their experience of British higher education. The Chevening scholarships are a crucial way of building relationships with the next generations of leaders."

Mr Blair also announced that the prestige Chevening Scholarship Scheme would be expanded. Currently supporting 2200 students, the aim is to offer an extra 500 scholarships, with funding from government, universities and business.

In partnership with The British Council the Government will undertake a 3 year global marketing campaign, starting in January 2000 in key countries around the world. Funded with around £5m from Government, the marketing strategy will brand UK education as the first for quality and choice.

Baroness Kennedy, the Chairman of the British Council, said: "we want to support the efforts of British universities and colleges to market themselves professionally with an image and standards of service which reflect our high standards".

Notes to Editors

The next steps in the strategy are:

- June /July 99
  - Changes to visa, work and entry requirements
  - Universities and colleges informed
- June to October 99
  - "UK Education Brand" developed in consultation with universities and colleges
- October 1999
  - Recruitment opens for Chevening scholars to study from October 2000
- end 1999
  - Production of brand toolkit of materials and resources
- start 2000
  - Launch of marketing campaign worldwide

Financial and human resources invested in education

	Public expenditure for educational institutions as a percentage of GDP	Index of change in public expenditure for educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (1990 = 100)	Percentage of expenditure on educational institutions from private sources (initial sources of funds)	Annual expenditure per student in equivalent US dollars			Index of change in annual expenditure per student (1990 = 100)		Teacher salaries in public lower secondary education after 15 years of experience	
				Primary education	Secondary education	Tertiary education	Primary and secondary education	Tertiary education	Annual statutory teacher salary in equivalent US dollars	Salary per statutory teaching hour in equivalent US dollars
Australia	4.5	114	18	3 121	4 899	10 590	110	114	m	m
Austria	5.3	113	m	5 572	7 118	7 943	115	104	26 249	40
Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	28 346	39
Canada	5.8	111	10	m	m	11 471	107	98	m	m
Czech Republic	4.8	m	15	1 999	2 820	6 795	m	m	8 279	14
Denmark	6.5	117	7	5 713	6 247	8 157	m	m	28 388	38
Finland	6.6	96	m	4 253	4 946	7 315	85	103	27 758	m
France	5.8	118	9	3 379	6 182	6 569	114	100	28 949	45
Germany	4.5	m	22	3 361	6 254	8 897	98	m	38 826	54
Greece	3.7	m	m	m	1 950	2 716	m	m	17 156	27
Hungary	4.9	79	11	1 532	1 591	4 792	m	m	4 789	10
Iceland	4.5	108	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	4.7	131	8	2 144	3 395	7 249	133	90	37 154	51
Italy	4.5	80	n	4 673	5 348	5 013	91	69	23 487	38
Japan	3.6	105	m	4 065	4 465	8 768	m	m	m	m
Korea	3.6	m	m	2 135	2 332	5 203	m	m	42 597	93
Luxembourg	4.3	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	4.6	163	m	1 015	1 798	5 071	165	114	m	m
Netherlands	4.6	106	3	3 191	4 351	9 026	110	90	30 898	34
New Zealand	5.3	109	m	2 638	4 120	8 737	m	m	23 393	30
Norway	6.8	125	m	m	m	9 647	m	m	21 127	35
Poland	5.2	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Portugal	5.4	m	m	m	m	6 073	m	m	24 501	38
Spain	4.8	119	16	2 628	3 455	4 944	125	134	28 783	32
Sweden	6.6	m	2	5 189	5 643	13 168	m	m	22 846	40
Switzerland	5.5	107	m	5 893	7 601	15 685	101	98	51 787	61
Turkey	2.2	76	m	m	m	m	m	m	954	m
United Kingdom	4.6	113	m	3 328	4 246	7 225	106	74	29 946	41
United States	5.0	m	m	5 371	6 812	16 262	m	m	31 327	32
Country mean	**4.9**		**9**	**3 546**	**4 606**	**8 134**			**26 649**	**40**
WEI Participants										
Argentina	3.4	m	17	1 158	1 575	m	m	m	12 541	14
Brazil	5.0	m	m	870	1 018	m	m	m	7 341	11
Chile	3.0	m	45	1 807	2 059	8 436	m	m	12 991	15
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	2.4	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	740	m	m	m	4 788	5
Israel	7.0	m	14	3 162	4 305	10 132	m	m	m	m
Jordan	m	m	m	710	710	m	m	m	11 519	14
Malaysia	4.9	m	2	1 228	2 308	11 016	m	m	27 956	36
Paraguay	3.1	m	m	343	492	m	m	m	m	m
Philippines	3.0	m	m	337	342	m	m	m	7 318	m
Russian Federation	3.4	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1 482	2
Thailand	3.6	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1 203	2
Uruguay	2.7	m	m	920	1 022	2 441	m	m	857	2

m = missing data.
Note: The student/teaching staff ratio is not the same as class size.
* Mostly short first university programmes.
** Mostly long first university programmes.

Tables	**B1.1**	**B1.2**	**B3.1**	**B4.1**	**B4.1**	**B4.1**	**B4.1/B4.2**	**B4.1/B4.2**	**E1.1b**	**E1.1b**
Pages	81	85	102	118	118	118	118/119	118/119	272	272

United Kingdom Mission

To the Office of the
United Nations and Other
International Organisations at Geneva
37/39 Rue de Vermont
1211 Geneva 20

Telephone: 918 2300
Facsimile: 918 2333

From the Permanent Representative

12 May 2000

Mr Abid Hussain
Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection
of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
Palais des Nations
CH-1211 Genéve 10

Dear Mr Hussain,

Thank you for your letter of 18 February enclosing the report of your visit to the UK and Northern Ireland in October 1999. I am grateful to you for sharing the report with us at an early stage.

I have been asked to forward to you the enclosed additional pieces of information which you may find useful. In particular, we should like to draw your attention to the comments in your report on the UK Government's Freedom of Information Bill. Since your visit, the Government has amended its draft bill. Those amendments address many of the issues you have highlighted.

Yours sincerely

S W J Fuller

Annex

Paragraph 8: The peace process in Northern Ireland has been going on for longer than two years. The talks on the Northern Ireland peace process began in 1995 and culminated in the Belfast Agreement of April 1998. These talks have lead to major constitutional and political changes, setting it on the path towards permanent peace.

Further, we would like to highlight the role of the British Irish Intergovernmental Conference (BIIGC) and the link to the three strands of the peace process. We would also like to point out the correct date for the referendum was 22 May 1998; the Good Friday Agreement was accepted by a clear majority in a referendum in both Northern Ireland and the Republic on 22 May 1998. It creates institutions that deal with three sets of relationships between the UK and Ireland. The first strand deals with relationships within Northern Ireland. An Assembly and Executive based on cross-community support were established. Strand 3 (East-West relations) brought into being a British Irish Council that incorporates members of all the devolved administrations within the UK as well as the British and Irish Governments. It also established a British-Irish Inter-Governmental Conference to take forward mutual cooperation on matters of bilateral interest and on matters not devolved to the Northern Ireland Assembly.

Finally on this paragraph we would like to inform you that reluctantly, the British Government has had to suspend the operation of devolved government in Northern Ireland in order to preserve the progress that has been made so far and to create a space to resolve outstanding issues particularly the decommissioning of paramilitary weapons.

Paragraph 9: Although the Human Rights Act was passed in 1988, it does not become law until 1999.

Paragraph 13: The UK ratified the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 10 December 1999.

Paragraph 17: We would like to point out that the commercial television business is regulated by the Independent Television Commission.

Paragraph 18: The Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice, which was adopted on 1 December 1999, is drawn up by the press and forms the basis of a self-regulatory system. Further, the majority of the Commission's 16 members are lay members.

Paragraph 24: The Defamation Act 1996 stipulated that a person may be exonerated for the responsibility for publication if he/she shows that he/she was not the authors, editor or publisher of the statement complained of and that he/she took reasonable care in relation to the publication and did not know that he/she was contributing to the publication of a defamatory statement.

Paragraph 25: Section 10 of the Contempt of Court Act says that a court may not require a person to disclose a source etc.

Paragraph 29: We would like to point out that the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission has not been entrusted with writing a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland. However, it has been invited to consult and advise on the scope for defining in Westminster legislation, rights supplementary to those in the ECHR, to reflect the particular circumstances of Northern Ireland, drawing as appropriate on international instruments and experience. These additional rights to reflect the principles of mutual respect for the identity and ethoses of both communities and parity of esteem, and taken together with the ECHR constitute a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 30: We would like to point out that the Policing Commission chaired by Christopher Patten, called for a human rights based approach to policing in Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 33: The Police Ombudsperson, Mrs Nuala O'Loan will conduct investigations of complaints in NI filed against the police.

Paragraph 57: The Spycatcher case was a civil case about breach of confidence, not a criminal one.

Paragraph 63: The Government published a draft Freedom of Information Bill on May 24 1999 as a consultation paper. The draft Bill was subject to pre-legislative scrutiny by committees of both Houses of Parliament and a public consultation exercise. This paper was not intended to be introduced into Parliament. Unfortunately, when you visited the Home Office, the Government had not made its response to the consultation exercise or the recommendations of the Select Committees. Your report therefore relates to the draft Bill and does not take account of the changes made by the Government following the public consultation exercise and pre-legislative scrutiny. An amended Bill was introduced into Parliament on 18 November and has just completed its Committee stage in the House of Commons.

Paragraph 64: The Bill will ensure that all people including journalists, will have the right to information contained in records held by public authorities, and will be able to request to see the records themselves. Public authorities will have to comply with an applicant's preferences (i.e. to inspect the original, receive a copy or a digest of the information) where it is reasonably practicable to do so.

Paragraph 65: You note criticisms which had been levelled at the draft Bill. Since your visit, the Government has amended the draft Bill in many of the areas you were concerned about:

1) The Government removed the class exemption relating to regulatory investigations and proceedings and replaced it with a prejudice test exemption. The Government also decided that departments, when considering whether to disclose information relating to decision-making and the formulation of Government policy, should take particular account of the desirability of disclosing factual and background material.

2) In response to criticisms, the Government also decided to strengthen the role of the Information Commissioner in two important ways - the Commissioner is now able to recommend discretionary disclosures where he considers that the public interest in disclosure outweighs the public interest in maintaining the exemption in question and will also gain the power to enforce compliance with publication schemes.

Paragraph 66: However, the two examples of class exemptions you cite in this paragraph (international relations and information whose disclosure would prejudice - among other things - ministerial collective responsibility) are not in fact class exemptions, but are prejudice based. Also, the Government has removed the class exemption for civil investigations. The class exemption now relates only to criminal proceedings as you recommend.

Paragraph 67: Ministerial certificates are nothing more than evidential certificates; i.e. the Minister certifying that the information is of the kind specified. They are open to challenge in the Tribunal, by the Commissioner or the applicant, and the Tribunal determines whether the certificate is valid. There is no Ministerial veto. In some countries ministerial certificates are vetoes on the disclosure of information. This is not the case in the UK.

The Commissioner will have wide powers to compel the disclosure where he judges that an exemption does not properly apply. However, the Government believes firmly that it is for democratically elected representatives to determine what is, or is not, in the public interest. Therefore, the Information Commissioners will only have the power to recommend disclosure of exempt information in the public interest. However, when

taken together with the requirement on authorities to give reasons for not disclosing information, the Bill will ensure that decisions not to disclose are taken only where the public interest requires secrecy.

Paragraph 68: The power of authorities to require the applicant's reasons before making a discretionary disclosure in the public interest has now been removed. However, the Bill still only provides for such disclosures where they are lawful. There are both legal and policy reasons for this. For instance the information may be barred from disclosure by EU law, or it may be subject to the common law of confidence. The Government has decided not to overturn the common law of confidence in the FOI Bill.

Paragraph 96: We would like to point out that Precious Life the anti-abortion organisation is based in Northern Ireland, not the United States.

Annex: Stephen Webb is a member of the Security, Policy and Operations Division not the Security and International Division. Further, you also met with Nicholas Hodgson when you visited the UK. He is a member of the Legal Adviser's Group in the Lord Chancellor's Department.

- - - - -